

Date: Tue, 3 May 94 04:30:06 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #191
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Tue, 3 May 94 Volume 94 : Issue 191

Today's Topics:

[News] FCC Gets New Weapon
Canadian Rules

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 29 Apr 94 18:48:04 GMT
From: agate!overload.lbl.gov!dog.ee.lbl.gov!ihnp4.ucsd.edu!pacbell.com!amdahl!
netcomsv!dodge!not-for-mail@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
Subject: [News] FCC Gets New Weapon
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <2pol93\$qrp@paperboy.gsfc.nasa.gov>,
Erich Franz Stocker <stocker@spso.gsfc.nasa.gov> wrote:
>In article <phb.767540105@melpar> Paul H. Bock,
>phb@syseng1.melpar.esys.com writes:
>> IMHO, most hams who transgress do it *knowingly* and therefore
>should
>> be subjected to harsher penalties than the poor dweeb who's led astray
>by
>> the radio salesman. Maybe there should also be a penalty for the sales-
>> man/dealer who doesn't *actively* inform his customers of the rules...
>>
>
>IMHO this view is what is wrong with this country to a very large
>measure. I don't know why someone else should be penalized for
>your transgressions. It isn't the salesperson's responsibility to

>ensure that you operate within the rules. It isn't his/her responsibility
>to ensure that you know the rules. You have the legal responsibility
>for finding out and complying with any transmission laws or
>regulations. The salesperson just has a legal obligation not to
>mislead you about the nature of the product or its use.
>
>This is the same garbage that they have done to bartenders. Holding
>a bartender responsible for controlling the patron's drinking is
>stupid. We are all, once again, going to have to take responsibility
>for our own actions rather than finding others to blame.

If we're taking a poll, I'm going to have to agree with Paul.

I'm not sure where your coming from, Erich. And I'm not sure why you would use "IMHO", cause you really don't sound that humble. I think what's wrong with the whole world is because of people like you. In your reasoning, it must be perfectly acceptable to sell drugs, weapons, or anything else that could be used in an illegal or inhumane way. Hey, it's not your fault, your not the one who actually used the device or substance... People like that are driven by greed. All they think about is what they are going to gain. They have no conscience of what the other person is going to do or you may get hurt from it.

Erich, do you think it would be alright to sell a gun to someone that you know will use it to rob a bank, or murder someone? What if they offered you a million dollars? You might be really tempted, but if you did then you would be condoning the actions of the other person. You should be held accountable to some degree for the crime, because you knew about it and went along with it.

Let's get back to your example of a car salesman. Do you think a car dealer would let you test drive a car if you did not have a license? Now let's say that they knew but they let you test drive the car anyway. If you hit someone or ran over someone, who do you think the judge is going to hold responsible? Wouldn't you say that the dealer shared part of the blame since he knew you were doing something illegal and did nothing to stop you?

Now how about that bartender. I have to tell you that I am dearly grateful for any and every bartender in the world that has prevented someone from getting killed by a drunk driver. Maybe that is the real problem, typically I'm sure that they get all the blame but none of the thanks for what they do. If a stupid idiot wants to drink to the point that they cannot drive, then they should do their drinking at home, not at a location where they will HAVE to drive to get home.

Everyone should be held accountable for their actions including whatever they contribute to another person's actions. The problem is that there

is no way to achieve complete justice in this system of things. We need
God's government as expressed in the Lord's prayer to accomplish that...

Sincerely yours,
an advocate of God's Kingdom

(All expressed opinions contained herein are mine and not necessarily
shared by my employer.)

Date: 2 May 94 22:42:15 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!magnus.acs.ohio-
state.edu!falcon.bgsu.edu!bgsuvax!sdougla@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Canadian Rules
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Can anyone tell me something about how the classes, privileges and
testing procedures for amateur radio work in Canada? Thank you.

Thanx in advance

-----*****-----
Sean G. Douglas KB8IXP *****Internet: sdougla@andy.bgsu.edu
Physics and Mathematics *****LandLine: 419 372 6142
SkyWarn Net Volunteer *****
Amateur Radio Emergency Service *****
Bowling Green State University ****
Offenhauer East 1003 ***
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403 **

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #191
